

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. No claims are amended in the present response, however, Applicant has provided a listing of the claims for the Examiner's convenience. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

I. The §103 Rejections

Claims 1-14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0120787 ("Shapiro") in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0015839 ("Sarkar").

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro and Sarkar, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,713 ("Guheen").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 recites a method for converting display source code of a legacy application having mixed application logic and presentation logic on a server to a network interactive web-browser page.

In particular, the method includes resolving the display source code of the legacy application into a plurality of record formats, in which each record format corresponds to source code associated with an input/output screen of the legacy application. The method further includes parsing each record format into a corresponding intermediate file that is renderable by a web browser, in which each intermediate file includes static content and dynamic content. Each intermediate file is then converted into a web page.

A. Shapiro Fails To Disclose Resolving Display Source Code of a Legacy Application Into a Plurality of Record Formats, in Which Each Record Format Corresponds To Source Code Associated with an Input/Output Screen of the Legacy Application

Shapiro discloses a system and method for accessing functionality of a backend system from an application server (see Abstract). The backend system may be a legacy system that implements one or more callable functions (paragraphs 0034-0035). To provide access to the legacy system through an application server, Shapiro's system includes a data mining (client) computer system 82 that executes software code to the backend system 112 and receive information specifying the functionality of the backend system 112. The data mining client 82 then analyzes the received information and programmatically creates information based on the analysis for accessing the functionality of the backend server (paragraph 0090).

Accordingly, Shapiro discloses programmatically creating information that is useable for accessing the functionality of the backend system based on analysis of one or more callable functions of a legacy system (see also paragraph 0039). In contrast, claim 1 recites resolving display source code of a legacy application into a plurality of record formats, in which each record format corresponds to source code associated with an input/output screen of the legacy application. Each record format is then parsed into an intermediate file and converted into a corresponding web page. Thus, claim 1 requires generating web pages based on each input/output screen (or record format) of the legacy application.

On page 8 of the Action dated June 26, 2006, the Examiner asserts that "[t]he analyzed information from the backend system is stored in a plurality of database record formats". Even assuming the Examiner is correct, the analyzed information in Shapiro's system corresponds to one or more callable functions of a legacy system. The analyzed information does not correspond to each input/output screen of the legacy system or application, as required by claim

1. Applicant's invention creates web pages based on a legacy application in a different manner than the technique disclosed by Shapiro.

Furthermore, on page 2 of the Action, the Examiner cites paragraphs 0090-0091, 0109 and 0130-135 of Shapiro as disclosing each record format corresponding to source code associated with an input/output screen of a legacy application. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In the cited portions, Shapiro discloses only storing information that has been programmatically created based on the functionality of a back end system within a repository. Shapiro does not disclose that the programmatically created information corresponds to source code associated with an input/output screen of a legacy application.

B. Sarkar and Guheen Fail To Disclose Resolving Display Source Code of a Legacy Application Into a Plurality of Record Formats, in Which Each Record Format Corresponds To Source Code Associated with an Input/Output Screen of the Legacy Application

Sarkar discloses a method and system for running application code originally developed as simple Java Beans, in an Enterprise Java Bean (EJB) environment, without modifying the original application code (see Abstract). Guheen discloses a method and system for identifying alliances among a plurality of business entities in components of a network framework (see Abstract). The Examiner does not cite Sarkar or Guheen as disclosing resolving display source code of a legacy application into a plurality of record formats, in which each record format corresponds to source code associated with an input/output screen of the legacy application. Nevertheless, as with Shapiro, Sarkar and Guheen each fail to disclose this limitation.

C. The claim has limitations not taught by either reference

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.

Shapiro, Sarkar and Guheen fail to disclose resolving display source code of a legacy application into a plurality of record formats, in which each record format corresponds to source code associated with an input/output screen of the legacy application. Consequently, the combination of Shapiro, Sarkar and Guheen cannot render claim 1 obvious.


D. Other Independent Claims

Independent claims 10-13 incorporate limitations similar to those of claim 1. Claims 10-13 (and the claims that depend therefrom) are also allowable over the combination of Shapiro, Sarkar and Guheen for reasons corresponding to those set forth with respect to claim 1.

Applicant submits that claims 1-16 are allowable over the references cited above, and are in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

August 28, 2006
Date



Kelvin M. Vivian
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 53,727
(650) 475-1448